

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,406	11/03/2000	James P. Tagg	TAG P-3	7866

28752 7590 08/23/2004
LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP
LACKENBACH SIEGEL BUILDING
1 CHASE ROAD
SCARSDALE, NY 10583

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAI V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,406

Applicant(s)

TAGG, JAMES P.

Examiner

Hai V. Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-13b, 15-16, and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-13b, 15-16, and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received on 27 May 2004.
2. Claims 1-8, 11-13b, 15, 16, and 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 11, 12, 13b, 15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 1 recites the limitation of "...**the** configuration of a tunnel....under control of **the** client system, **the** connection to the host system...**the** comparison...**the** mobile system to **the** target network thru **the** fixed system. " in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. Claim 11 recites the limitation of " As claimed in 1 where **the** link...". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 12 recites the limitation of " As claimed in 1 where **the** client configuration...". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. Claim 13b recites the limitation of " As claimed in 1 where **packets** can be routed thru **the** cellular system to **the** Internet automatically upon loss of **the** fixed wireless connection.". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 15 recites the limitation of " As claimed in 1 where **the** data stream is encrypted, either selectively or prior to being sent to **the** server and decrypted prior to

Art Unit: 2142

being sent to the network such that **the** privacy and security of the client are maintained". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 20 recites the limitation of " A system as described in 1 where **the** server...". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Objections

11. Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

12. Claim 20 recites the limitation of "**A system as described in 1** where the server is any available member located at sufficient physical and or logical distance from the host that security and privacy are maintained". While claim 1 recites **the method** of connection to a network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 13b, 15, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paulsen** et al. U.S. patent no. **6,055,575** in view of **Lynch** U.S. patent no. **6,487,600 B1**.

Art Unit: 2142

15. As to claim 1, Paulsen, Virtual Private Network System And Method, discloses a method of connection to a network comprising:

under control of host system, the configuration of a tunnel (*Paulsen, Abstract, col. 3, lines 25-61*).

under the control of client system, the connection to the host system (*Paulsen, Abstract, col. 3, lines 25-61*). However, Paulsen does not explicitly disclose a matching means for comparing system preferences to establish the secure connection between the mobile system and the target network thru the fixed network. Thus, the artisan would have been motivated to look into the related networking art for potential system for implementing under control of a matching means, the comparison of the host system and client system preferences and, if a match is made, the automatic establishing of a secure link from the mobile system to the target network thru the fixed system.

In the same field of endeavor, Lynch, related System And Method For Supporting Multimedia Communications Upon A Dynamically Configured Member Network, discloses in analogy art, disclose as *an alternate operation, communication are accomplished via the Internet or another packet switched network. As compared to the links established in a telephone network, these links may be called "pseudo links" because no direct channel is established between network members. However, in stabling the pseudo links, analogous techniques are employed to ensure that only two intended network members communicate over the pseudo link. In one embodiment, a tunnel is setup for each link established and released when the link is complete* (Lynch,

Art Unit: 2142

col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 49; col. 10, 54 – col. 11, line 22; col. 15, line 56 – col. 17, line 15).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention made to have incorporated Paulsen's teachings of providing the control of host and client systems for configuration and connection (*Paulsen, Abstract, col. 3, lines 25-61*) with the teachings of Lynch, for the purpose of *enhancing the security of the link (Lynch, col. 4, lines 40-49)*. Paulsen also suggests that *the system also permits an individual to access the private data network without incurring any long distance telephone charges (Paulsen, col. 3, lines 25-61)*.

16. As to claim 2, Paulsen-Lynch discloses wherein the comparison is made in a server (*Lynch, Fig. 23, item 2300*).

17. As to claim 3, Paulsen-Lynch discloses wherein the fixed network is the Internet (*Lynch, Fig. 23, item 2316 to Internet*).

18. As to claim 4, Paulsen-Lynch discloses wherein the fixed network is the PSTN (*Lynch, Fig. 23, item 2320 to PSTN*).

19. As to claim 5, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the fixed system is, itself, mobile and connected to another fixed system in a manner that can be repeated recursively until a connection to the target network is made (*Lynch, col. 12, lines 1-12; col. 13, line 66 – col. 14, line 13*).

20. As to claim 6, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the host systems and the client systems are members of service that gives reciprocal roaming rights (*Lynch, col. 20, lines 1-25*).

Art Unit: 2142

21. As to claim 7, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the host system publishes a cost of obtaining a link and the mobile client system has a preprogrammed limit to the amount it is willing to pay for a link and if the cost is less than or equal to the limit then the link is automatically established (*Lynch, col. 14, lines 14-59*).

22. As to claim 8, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the host system is not connected to a network and will make connection to that network upon request by a client (*Lynch, col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25*).

23. As to claim 11, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the link is not automatically established out rather the user is given notification of availability of a link that they accept or reject (*Lynch, col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25*).

24. As to claim 12, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the client configuration is performed automatically by the host upon boot up (*Lynch, col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25*).

25. As to claim 13b, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where packets can be automatically routed thru multiple connection means under control of the mobile device and server system (*Lynch, col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25; col. 35, lines 6-67*).

26. As to claim 15, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the data stream is encrypted, either selectively or prior to being sent to the server and decrypted prior to being sent to the network such that the privacy and security for the client are maintained (*Lynch, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 49; col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25; col. 35, lines 6-67*).

Art Unit: 2142

27. As to claim 16, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the encryption can be selectively applied to the data stream depending on preferences (*Lynch, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 49; col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25; col. 35, lines 6-67*).

28. As to claim 20, Paulsen-Lynch discloses where the server is nay available member located at sufficient physical or logical distance from the host that security and privacy are maintained (*Lynch, col. 3, line 55 – col. 4, line 49; col. 21, line 49 – col. 22, line 25; col. 35, lines 6-67*).

29. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this action.

Art Unit: 2142

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-306-0276. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on 703-305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hai V. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2142



JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER